

# SOVIET AFFAIRS ANALYSIS SERVICE

Distributed in the U.S. and Canada by the American Committee for Liberation,  
1657 Broadway, New York 19, N. Y.

The Institute for the Study of the USSR is a free corporation of scholars who have left the Soviet Union. Its purpose is to make available to the Free World analyses of contemporary events and detailed studies of various aspects of the Soviet system by persons who know the system intimately. Opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect views or policies of the Institute.

No. 27, 1959/60

18 April 1960

## Outline of Reference Paper On:

### KHRUSHCHEV'S TRIP TO FRANCE AS REFLECTED IN THE SOVIET PRESS

by

Boris A. Litvinov

Khrushchev's French visit represents an excellent illustration of what the Soviets call "open diplomacy." Although he returned empty-handed as far as concrete diplomatic accomplishments are concerned, he did achieve his primary aims--the influencing of the masses over the heads of Government. In all his speeches in France Khrushchev endeavored to create a favorable climate of opinion for "peace" and "peaceful coexistence." The extensive coverage of his tour by French press and radio and his TV address to the French population helped him immeasurably in his propaganda effort.

However, despite his espousal of "open diplomacy," Khrushchev departed from this method when he considered it expedient. This was true in situations where the exposure of Soviet policy to public discussion would not prove advantageous. In such cases he resorted to the methods of traditional diplomacy.

In general, the method of "open diplomacy" is a tool of the Soviet leaders--- an undisguised means for interfering in the internal affairs of other countries and spreading demagogic propaganda in the free world. It is part of the struggle for the victory of Communism throughout the world during the period of "peaceful coexistence" which necessitates "the holding onto one's positions in the ideological conflict without using arms in order to get one's way."

CIRCULATION COPY 1

# SOVIET AFFAIRS ANALYSIS SERVICE

*Distributed in the U.S. and Canada by the American Committee for Liberation.  
1657 Broadway, New York 19, N. Y.*

*The Institute for the Study of the USSR is a free corporation of scholars who have left the Soviet Union. Its purpose is to make available to the Free World analyses of contemporary events and detailed studies of various aspects of the Soviet system by persons who know the system intimately. Opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect views or policies of the Institute.*

No. 27, 1959/60

## KHRUSHCHEV'S TRIP TO FRANCE AS REFLECTED IN THE SOVIET PRESS

by

Boris A. Litvinov

Khrushchev's use during his French visit of what the Soviet press calls "open diplomacy" is an excellent illustration of Soviet mass persuasion in the international arena. It resulted in a minimum of concrete diplomatic accomplishments despite the constant claims of significant successes. Khrushchev himself admitted in a speech at a public meeting in Moscow on April 4 that his talks with De Gaulle had little effect and that both sides had retained their previous attitudes.

From the viewpoint of classical diplomacy, it would not be too much to say that Khrushchev returned from France empty-handed. The slight extension of cultural and scientific cooperation agreed upon certainly did not justify the intense diplomatic and propaganda activity preceding this minor agreement.

However, it would be a great mistake to judge the results of Khrushchev's visit to France solely from the point of view of traditional diplomacy. They must be judged in the context of what the Soviets call "open diplomacy." It was not Khrushchev's aim to win over the convinced enemies of Communism. He emphasized the contrary in all his speeches:

....You like your system. By all means live under a Capitalist regime. That will not worry us.... I shall not call upon you to take up Communism if you do not want to take this road yourselves (speech of March 25 to the members of various parliamentary groups, Pravda, March 27, 1960).

(more)

The primary purpose of Soviet "open diplomacy" is to influence directly the masses of the population, if need be, over the heads of the Government. In achieving its goals wide use is made of promises as well as threats. For example, in addressing the members of various parliamentary groups on March 25 in Paris, Khrushchev stated:

In the next few years you will lag behind us in your economic development, and this will be natural, since a Socialist regime, a Communist regime, provides better opportunities for exploiting all the material resources and cultural values of a country for its rapid development, for raising the peoples' living standards and culture.

In a speech to the Paris Chamber of Commerce on March 24, Khrushchev stressed the profit for France of trade links with the USSR (Pravda, March 25, 1960). At Dijon on March 28, he vigorously advertized his "friendship" with the Catholic canon and "champion of peace" Felix Kir (Pravda, March 29, 1960), and in Rheims the following day he attempted to play on the anti-German feeling of persons who had suffered acutely during the war (Ibid., March 30).

In all his speeches, Khrushchev aimed to create a favorable climate of opinion in France --for the primary goals of the Soviet "struggle for peace" and "peaceful coexistence." It is thus clear that in his innumerable speeches advocating peace, and urging an economic and cultural approachment between France and the USSR, Khrushchev was by no means counting upon revision of French foreign policy. He wanted only to exert as great an influence as possible upon the feelings and imagination of the ordinary Frenchman to win his confidence and his sympathies.

In accomplishing these purposes his trip must be viewed as successful. For his speeches received complete radio and press coverage. In addition he was given the opportunity to address directly the entire population of the country over television prior to his departure.

However, despite his espousal of "open diplomacy" Khrushchev departs from this method when he considers it expedient. This is especially true in situations where the exposure of Soviet policy to public discussion would not prove advantageous. In such cases even Khrushchev resorts to the methods of traditional diplomacy. A good example is the reply which he gave at the press conference held at Rambouillet on April 2 to a reporter's question as to whether he had discussed the position in Algeria with General De Gaulle:

General De Gaulle and I discussed many questions. We exchanged opinions on many matters, each of us expressing his own point of view. On the subject of Algeria, we also exchanged opinions, and each of us expressed his own views-- what views (we discussed) is the business of the President and myself (Pravda, April 4, 1960).

(more)

From the Soviet point of view, the method of "open diplomacy" like the principle of "peaceful coexistence," can only be implemented if there are no opponents who can effectively refute the demagogic utterances of the Soviet Party leaders. During Khrushchev's visit to France, the police measures taken by the French Government did much to create such a situation. As a result, few persons were found desirous of replying to Khrushchev. Most Soviet commentators pointed this out with evident satisfaction. At the same time, they seemed remarkably sensitive to the slightest manifestations of disagreement with the Soviet point of view and reacted to them pettishly on every occasion. The Sovetskaya Rossiya correspondent, G. Rassadin, for example, responded as follows to the article by Andre Francois-Poncet published by Figaro:

What is disturbing Francois-Poncet, this former ambassador to Hitlerite Germany? He is exasperated by the prospect of Franco-Soviet rapprochement, which may prove an obstacle to a renaissance of West German militarism and revanchism.

The Izvestia correspondents A. Adzhubei, S. Zykov and M. Mikhailov were forced to admit the fact that on many Paris streets the crowd shouted the word "Budapest":

Someone wrote the word "Budapest" on many houses in Paris. Why "Budapest"? Fascism was searching for a foothold in Hungary. The counterrevolution was cutting off the heads of Communists. And the counterrevolution was checked. This is now known to the majority of thinking people in the world. But there are people in France who want to tickle the nerves of Frenchmen who are not very far advanced in political questions by reminding them of Budapest and the events in Hungary (Izvestia, April 3, 1960).

The method of "open diplomacy," impatient of opposing opinions, aggressive and hypocritical, is a tool of the Soviet Party leaders. It is an undisguised means for interfering in the internal affairs of other countries and spreading unashamed and demagogic propaganda in the free world. It is part of the struggle for the victory of Communism throughout the world during the period of "peaceful coexistence," a struggle whose main tasks, according to Khrushchev are to "hold onto one's positions in the ideological conflict without using arms in order to get one's way." (Izvestia, September 6, 1959).

Khrushchev's visit to France represented another move in this continuing conflict.

(042860)